

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

ROBERT R. VANDERPOOL,

Defendant.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

No. 5:16-cv-05815

ORDER

On January 17, 2017, the Court denied the United States' request to use an alternative method of service because it had not shown that it had exhausted all efforts to serve the Defendant using one of the methods permitted by the federal or state rules of civil procedure. ECF No. 3. In particular, the Court pointed out that the United States had not attempted to review publicly-available court records to see if they contained any information about the Defendant's whereabouts, despite the fact that the United States' process server had learned from a neighbor that the Defendant was last seen being removed from his previous address by the police.

In that order, the Court also reminded the United States that it had twenty-one days remaining from the date of the order to effect service.

A few days later, the United States moved for an extension of time to effect service. The motion, however, does not explain why the United States needs more than twenty-one days to search court records for the Defendant's address (or finish any other efforts to attempt service under the rules), nor does it state how much additional time the United States is seeking to have.

Accordingly, this 6th day of February, 2017, the United States' Motion to Extend Time to Make Service, ECF No. 4, is **DENIED** without prejudice to its ability to renew its request if it is able to show good cause for the Court to grant it one and if it expressly states how much additional time it seeks. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m).

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Joseph F. Leeson, Jr.

JOSEPH F. LEESON, JR.

United States District Judge